



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## **PARKING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

April 21, 2011

**Civic Center Plaza  
1200 Third Avenue, 14th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101**

<b>Board Members PRESENT</b>	<b>Board Members NOT PRESENT</b>
Frank Alessi Roger Lewis Richard Stegner Benjamin Nicholls Gary Smith Tom Brady John Cunningham Ernestine Bonn Linda Stanley Jennifer Finnegan	Michael McNeill Landry Watson Rob Weinberg Jennifer Finnegan

<b>CITY STAFF</b>
Meredith Dibden Brown – CPCI - OSB - Community Parking District Program Samir Hajjiri – CPCI – Transportation Planning Shahriar Ammi – CPCI – Transportation Planning Mark Rogers – E&CP - Transportation Engineering Lt. Randal Jones – San Diego Police Department Sgt. Keith Lucas – San Diego Police Department

### **1. Roll Call and Introductions**

Chair John Cunningham called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. and attendees introduced themselves.

## 2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from February 17, 2011 were approved.

**Motion: Tom Brady / Second: Ernestine Bonn. Abstained – Gary Smith. Motion Passed 9-0-1.**

## 3. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

## 4. Board Advisory Board Vice-Chair

The previous Vice-Chair, John Pilch, is no longer a member of the board since his term has ended. Vice Chair Duties may include responsibilities assigned by the Chair in addition to presiding over meetings in the absence of the Chair, John Cunningham. Mr. Cunningham nominated Gary Smith and then asked if there were any other nominations from the floor. There were none. Frank Alessi then commented favorably on Mr. Smith's knowledge and experience from working on the Downtown Parking Management Group (DPMG). Benjamin Nicholls also provided a caution for the Board to avoid being perceived as too Downtown-centric.

**Motion: Select Gary Smith as Vice-Chair.**

**John Cunningham / Second: Frank Alessi. Abstained – Gary Smith. Motion Passed 9-0-1.**

## 5. Board Administrative Items Administrative Items

Mr. Cunningham commented on the changes to the overall agenda to facilitate hearing new or old business items first and then hearing updates towards the end.

- a. None
- b. Mr. Cunningham explained that the Conflict of Interest applies only to items on the agenda since the Board does not have a City Conflict of Interest Code which would require the completion of Form 700 on an annual basis.
- c. Mr. Nicholls asked about the process for adding future agenda items and Mr. Cunningham advised that they could be brought suggested under this item or under updates.
- d. None.

## 6. Valet Parking Regulations and Processes

Mr. Smith advised that he had been working on submitting ordinance or policy language as part of his work on the DPMG to address the issue of public-requested changes in the public right-of-way. As lessees come and go from businesses they may submit an application and pay the fee to request a change in curb color, etc. However, City staff in evaluating the application does not consult with the respective CPD advisory board to see if the change complements their efforts. Therefore, Mr. Smith will be suggesting changes to require City staff to consult before making changes. Also, with regards to Valet zones in parking impacted areas, it does not make sense to dedicate space for that purpose when they may only be used for six hours on Friday and Saturday nights. He provided an example from Seattle where the valet zone actually has multiple uses indicated by comprehensive signage (co-incidentally see handout from Tom Brady on multiple parking signs for one location in

La Jolla). This multi-use would at worst be revenue-neutral but allows for potential revenue to be generated if meters may operate at alternate times. There was discussion about a similar situation for commercial loading zones.

Mr. Brady then provided some background on this issue. The La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Committee had discussed the request to relocate three of the 12 valet spaces on Prospect Street since the community planning group had denied a request for an additional 4 spaces. The handout provided by Mr. Brady was for the 12 space valet zone and the multiple uses indicated by multiple (confusing) signs on one sign pole for all spaces. As part of the discussion at the Committee an operator also offered to pay \$50,000 to the La Jolla Town Council out of the parking revenue. This then raised the question as to why the City does not participate in realizing the value?

There was additional discussion about the use of a public resource generating private business revenue and possible means of providing valet spaces such as an auction and a recap of previous comments by City staff on cost recovery. Mr. Smith noted that Council Policy 100-18 allows for the sharing of valet parking revenue with the CPD. Of the parking areas represented only La Jolla seems to be afforded an opportunity to weigh in on changes in the public right-of-way though sometimes such matters may go to the community planning group. There was also a comment that in La Jolla not all of the spaces appear to be utilized therefore the valet parking application process should consider how many spaces are really needed and make sure the spaces are not used for on-street storage of vehicles. It was also noted that in Little Italy a universal valet parking program is being piloted and a report should be issued soon.

After additional comments from board members on fees, costs, uses, signage, and application process, Mr. Smith advised he will incorporate these suggestions in the language he is preparing for presentation to the DPMG in May and provide to the PAB after that. After that he will look at other curb colors and procedures.

## **7. Parking Meter Utilization Plan Update – Information Only**

Staff advised that the plan was approved by City Council at the meeting of March 7, 2011 but the changes to the ordinance required a second reading and then 30 days to take effect. Recommended changes to rates, time limits, and time of operation will come from the community and then be provided to City staff; OSB will review along with Parking Meter Operations who then coordinates with Traffic Engineering staff and Streets for any work needed in the public right-of-way.

## **8. Proposed North Park Parking Pilot**

Pursuant to the recently completed North Park Parking Study, North Park Main Street is proposing to initiate a parking pilot around the parking garage located at the corner of 30<sup>th</sup> Street and University Avenue, following the procedures as required by City Council Policy 200-04. This includes surveying adjacent businesses/property owners to develop at least 60% support per block face. The results will help guide the proposed pilot locations and avoid gaps. The effects on unmetered and residential areas will have to be monitored and concerns addressed since the commercial district is very linear with residential in close proximity. The study also discussed having a more local meter district managed locally. North Park falls within the Mid-City CPD and the funds are administered under a City agreement with El Cajon Blvd BIA.

Enforcement would also be an issue. It is happening periodically now which causes problems during non-enforcement times. There was discussion about the possible need for enforcement in evening hours and questions as to how this could be implemented in metered and non-metered areas. A residential permit parking program could be part of a solution by the current policy is geared to areas around facilities such as SDSU and hospitals. It was also noted that for Cortez Hill that such permits are inexpensive and then have been sold on EBay for around \$300. Signage to direct visitors to the parking structure was also discussed and even though \$20,000 worth of signs has been installed it does not always work. Some restaurants will validate for structure parking.

## **9. Affordable Housing Parking Study Stakeholders Group Update**

City staff, Samir Hajjiri and Shahriar Ammi, provided an update on the activities of the Affordable Housing Parking Study Stakeholders Group and research and survey results to date.

Affordable housing is defined as those units with restrictions recorded against the property which determine: monthly rent; sales price; targeted ownership or rental households; occupancy; and length of affordability. Affordable housing does not include Section 8 low cost apartments.

Project Background:

- Parking requirements increase cost of development – up to 25%
- Parking requirements impact site design can increase land required by 37%
- Parking requirements can thwart infill & affordable projects
- Costs of excessive requirements disproportionate on lower income households
- As overall vehicle ownership rates have increased – ownership for lower income households has declined

Requiring too much parking for affordable housing may mean that public money is being spent on unused parking instead of more units but requiring too little can mean that residents and neighbors are inconvenienced so getting the parking right is very important. Parking spaces typically cost \$10,000-\$50,000 depending on the type of space (garage, lot, subterranean) and this development cost is translated into the cost of rent thus impacting affordability. Many Infill and affordable projects often can't pencil out because of parking requirements.

A consultant, Wilbur Smith Associates, was hired to assist with these key objectives to:

- Evaluate parking demand at local Affordable Housing developments
- Identify how parking demand is affected by different project and neighborhood characteristics
- Develop parking requirements for future Affordable Housing projects sensitive to their context

To date there have been two public workshops, focus group meetings, stakeholder meetings and updates to public officials. Residents have also been surveyed with surveys being distributed to Residents and Property managers at 34 sites selected from citywide inventory of which there were 1110 responses, equaling a 40% response rate. The survey asked about vehicle ownership, travel patterns, parking behaviors, and the information was linked to annual income data and on-site and on-street parking utilization data. The survey data was analyzed with these key concepts in mind:

- Household vehicle availability - Statistical measure linking vehicle ownership to parking demand
- Proximity to transit - Measure of transit service and availability for a housing development

- Neighborhood walkability - Measure of land use diversity and number of intersections

It was determined that household vehicle availability among survey respondents is almost half the average level for all rental housing units in San Diego. Almost half the households surveyed had no vehicle and 39% had only one car. Only 14% of households had more than one car. Vehicle availability is higher in households with greater annual income. Also, household vehicle availability is higher in areas that are less conducive to walking and have more limited access to transit. Based on this information, different zoning requirements may be reasonable for affordable housing overall (based on current vehicle ownership and income level) and that both walkability characteristics & transit accessibility impact vehicle availability and may warrant adjustment factors. Of interest was that on-site parking utilization data indicated parking was less utilized than the household survey responses implied but this is likely due to data being collected at one point in time and the survey was based on the residents' aggregate experience.

Based on the research and survey results strategies and policies will be developed regarding parking for affordable housing. Also, there will be a public work shop in June 2011 to vet these and then information will be taken to Committee and Council.

[Ongoing information is available on the City's website at: [www.sandiego.gov/affordpark/](http://www.sandiego.gov/affordpark/) ]

There was discussion about the presentation and clarifying questions and responses.

Mr. Brady volunteered to serve on the Affordable Housing Parking Study Stakeholders Group.

## 10. Board Priority Items

- a. Additional Meters
- b. In-lieu fees/Parking Requirements/Transit Overlay Zones
- c. New Technology
- d. Angle Parking Policy
- e. Parking Meter/Time Limits Council Policy 200-04
- f. Parking Permit Programs (Residential/Commercial?)

This Item was continued to allow time to provide updates.

## 11. Information - Updates

Lt. Randall Jones advised that he has been re-assigned and introduced his replacement Sgt. Keith Lucas.

- a. Downtown CPD – Mr. Alessi advised that the DPMG has proposed new rates and time limits for some of the new meters to be installed by the City in May which is expected to enhance usage and revenue.
- b. Uptown CPD - None – vacant.
- c. Mid-City CPD – Mr. Lewis advised that updates were covered under Item 8.
- d. Pacific Beach CPD - None – absent.
- e. La Jolla CPD – None - vacant.

- f. Old Town CPD – Mr. Stegner had nothing new at this time.
- g. CD1 – Mr. Brady noted that current items were covered in earlier items.
- h. CD2 – Mr. Cunningham had no additional items.
- i. CD3 – Ms. Bonn indicated that community members are upset with proposed Park Boulevard changes and reduction in parking for the Bus Rapid Transit project and the off-site mitigation and that SANDAG staffers did not note these concerns. Also, attended at a scoping meeting for the Plaza de Panama project are upset over the bridge bypass and cost of the parking structure. Also University Heights CDC has been working on angle parking on Meade to add 21 spaces.
- j. CD4 – None - vacant.
- k. CD5 – None – absent.
- l. CD6 – Ms. Stanley had nothing new but did note that in San Francisco on-street rates in the range of \$3.50 to \$18 were approved.
- m. CD7 – None – absent.
- n. CD8 – None – vacant.
- o. CPC – None – absent.
- p. BIDD – None – Mr. Nicholls had left the meeting.
- j. At-large Representative – Mr. Smith commented on the parking bridge over Harbor Drive providing a link to the parking structure and the Padres games. The Downtown signage program for parking availability is in process and will share information as this goes forward.

## 11. Next Meeting Date and Locations

The next meeting date is May 19, 2011 and the location is the same - Civic Center Plaza 14<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room, 1200 Third Avenue, San Diego.

## 12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

---

Final Approved:	May 19, 2011
Motion by:	Ernestine Bonn / Second: Frank Alessi
	Abstained – Rob Weinberg and Landry Watson. Motion Passed 7-0-2.
Revisions to Draft:	None

---